



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lent topical index and a long list of cases cited with page references. Especially does it give a simple yet illuminating treatment of the liability of employers for injury to employees, workmen's compensation laws, trade and labor associations, and labor disputes.

To the business man and the laborer desirous of knowing his rights and duties, of what is likely to be held legal or to be forbidden by the law, this work of Mr. Clark's will constitute an ideal hand-book, while to the student of labor conditions and controversies it will serve as a most convenient text.

R. F. HOXIE.

University of Chicago.

The Living Wage of Women Workers: A Study of Incomes and Expenditures of Four Hundred and Fifty Women Workers in the City of Boston. By LOUISE MARION BOSWORTH. (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1911. Pp. vi, 90.)

The present volume, prepared for the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston, is a study of the expenditures of 450 working-women in occupations varying from those called professional to those called "kitchen." It is at once a contrast in method to the report¹ recently published by the federal Bureau of Labor, which deals with the expenditures and earnings of much larger and at the same time more homogeneous groups,—444 retail saleswomen and 726 factory girls; and the very intensive study that has just been issued from the Labour Department of the Board of Trade of England² which presents in admirable detail thirty complete accounts sent weekly to the Department for one year but from which "no generalizations or theories on expenditures are offered."

In Miss Bosworth's volume we are given an interesting and readable account of the various types of lodgings in which working-women of Boston live and of certain general characteristics of their expenditures. From the statistical point of view, however, the volume is open to criticism, and it may be seriously questioned whether it throws any new light on the "living wage." The only

¹ *Report on Condition of Women and Child Wage-Earners in the United States*, vol. v. *Wage-Earning Women in Stores and Factories*.

² *Accounts of Expenditures of Wage-Earning Women and Girls*, Cd. 5963.

discussion of this point is to be found in less than three pages of Professor Baldwin's introduction, and, with facts as they are presented, one questions the validity of the conclusions that are drawn. Just what is meant by the "living wage of women workers" as it is used in the present volume is nowhere explained, and yet, if we are to accept the fact that the living wage in Boston is any specific sum, we should like to know its precise meaning. Does the living wage for women mean, as it does for men, the ability to keep others as well as one's self, to support a family or send money home to Russia or Italy? And is it not, to say the least, questionable to attempt to find any single "living wage" for all grades of women-workers from the kitchen employee to the professional woman, and any one living wage for all parts of Boston. Certainly the work of the professional woman involves expenses which the kitchen employee is not obliged to meet, and what represents a living wage for the latter may be far short for the former. Moreover, the section dealing with Boston in the report of the federal Bureau of Labor on *Wage-Earning Women in Stores and Factories* shows that average cost of shelter, food, heat, light and laundry varied for store employees from \$3.02 in Jamaica Plain to \$6.31 in the South and West Ends and Back Bay. For factory employees the average cost varied from \$3.66 in the North End to \$4.81 in the South and West End and Back Bay.³ Miss Bosworth's averages are from all parts of the city.

A fundamental objection, moreover, to accepting any of the conclusions drawn from the tables of averages is that we are not told what any of the averages represent. Just what occupations are included in the group called "professional," and how many budgets were obtained for this group, and what was the range of incomes within the group? Similar questions must be raised about the "clerical" group or the "factory employees"; what kinds of factories are represented and what occupations in those factories? Some such careful scrutiny of the make-up of the averages would seem to be necessary. In short if we are to accept any conclusions drawn from Miss Bosworth's averages, we must know a great deal more about the data that lie back of them. We are not, for example, even told the number of replies on which the different tables are based. Professor Baldwin casually mentions the fact

³ See *Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States*, vol. v, p. 92.

that "as not all of the 450 schedules which were received contained entries under all headings of inquiry the number of cases represented in the different tables varies somewhat. The number of schedules giving returns for clothing which was about the average number in the different divisions of the investigation was 399, distributed as follows: . . ." Then follows the only table that shows the number represented in any of the groups. These clothing returns represent 143 replies from the clerical group, 88 from factory employees, 64 from waitresses, 49 from salesgirls, 37 from the professional group, and 18 from kitchen workers; no discussion of what proportion these represent of the total number of any of these groups in Boston is given. In the classification by wage groups, the numbers vary as follows: 51 in the \$3-5 a week group, 185 in the \$6-8 group, 102 in the \$9-11 group, 36 in the \$12-14 group, and 25 in the group earning \$15 and over. No comment on these figures was thought necessary, nor was any statement prepared regarding the character of the data in any other group. Attention may be called to one other of a considerable number of statistical difficulties presented by these tables. In the table under the title "Annual Expenditures Representing Living Wage," the largest item is that for food, \$169.70, and the second largest item \$117.06, which is nearly \$30 larger than any other item, is the expenditure for "miscellaneous," a heading which really means nothing. In a preface to the volume it is acknowledged as a fair criticism that accurate statements of expenditure can be obtained only from account books and not from memory. In the present case we are told that "inaccuracies probably occur chiefly under the heading of miscellaneous expenditures," and yet this inaccurate miscellaneous group represents nearly one fourth of Professor Baldwin's living wage. The report, in short, raises a very considerable number of statistical difficulties. Miss Bosworth has given us an interesting and informing essay on living conditions and methods of expenditure among working-women in Boston. It does not seem to be of value, however, as a statistical contribution to a study of the "living wage" whatever that term may be taken to mean.

EDITH ABBOTT.

Hull-House, Chicago.